



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND "WHAT LABOR WANTS"

VICTOR S. YARROS

Chicago, Illinois

In Great Britain some time ago a series of very grave and industrially disastrous strikes led not only to very radical—revolutionary, many Tories called it—legislation in the interest of organized labor, but to a national searching of hearts, and to inquiries into the nature and probable effects of the upheaval that was manifestly taking place. One popular London newspaper opened its columns to a discussion of "What the Worker Wants" from every point of view. Employers, land owners, economists, labor leaders, eminent lawyers, and trained social workers contributed to the symposium, which was subsequently published in pamphlet form. We shall see presently that the suggestions made, or the conclusions reached, in that exceptionally interesting discussion are of great value and significance.

In the United States, in addition to the familiar kinds of strikes and lockouts, which cause much loss, suffering, and bad blood, we have witnessed new types of strikes—strikes in which systematic destruction of property, with grave risk to life, was a conspicuous feature. The McNamara trial and confessions, the recent Indianapolis "dynamite conspiracy" trial, the "Syndicalist" way of conducting strikes, the bold propaganda of class war and *sabotage* have put new vitality and poignancy into the discussion of the labor question. A number of eminent and earnest educators, sociologists, and philanthropists urged upon the President and Congress the creation of a representative industrial commission for the purpose of investigating the causes of such startling phenomena as the dynamite outrages by and for labor, the insistence upon the closed shop, the use of syndicalism, etc. The commission was created and President Taft appointed its nine members. The disappointment which was widely and justly expressed with the personnel of the commission, and the delay caused thereby, need not concern us here; the

important thing is the general recognition of the gravity of the situation and the desirability of a disinterested and profound study of the whole labor problem.

Yet, without the aid of commissions or formal inquiries, official or private, the thoughtful observer and student should be able to give a tolerably satisfactory statement of the demands and aims of labor. The material is abundant—annual reports of national, state, and local unions, speeches, pamphlets, editorials, and articles in the labor press. It can no longer be affirmed that labor is inarticulate; it speaks, it acts, and it has its philosophers, historians, and economists. Whether "what labor wants" is something that society can grant, that other classes can approve and sympathize with and help labor to obtain, is a different question, a question for social science.

Let us make a modest attempt to formulate labor's demands and expectations, and even a more modest attempt to indicate the judgment of catholic scientists and progressive sociologists on the demands and expectations.

And, first, what is labor? There are today three grand divisions in the labor army. There are the "old-fashioned" or moderate trade unionists; there are the socialistic elements, in or out of these unions, and, finally, there are the syndicalists, the advocates of "industrial" forms of organizations.

The modern unionist has not modified his views materially in twenty-five years. He is no revolutionist; he does not dream of overthrowing the whole social order. He has no quarrel with the wage system, private property in the means of production, the profit principle. He merely demands "a fair day's pay for a fair day's work." He constantly strives to secure higher wages, to shorten his work-day, to improve the conditions under which he works. True, his standards change. As Mr. Samuel Gompers frankly states, union labor will never "have enough." It will always be demanding more pay, shorter hours, and safer and healthier conditions of work. It will be demanding these things because society and industry, invention and discovery will never cease to advance, to raise the standards of living. Union labor crosses no bridges until it reaches them; it plumes itself on its reasonableness and practicality. It

deals with immediate problems and has no dogmas or utopian goals. In demanding the right to strike, to boycott, to bargain collectively, to exclude non-union labor, its leaders are prompted by no political or moral formula. These things are means to an end, and labor denies that either the means or the end would endanger the legitimate interests of other elements of society. In discussing either trade-union leaders are entirely willing to abide by the rule of reason; and this is why the average trade union seldom, if ever, rejects a fair proposal of arbitration. It believes that broad-minded employers themselves, after friendly discussion, would cheerfully accede to the demands of labor. It relies strongly on the human factor; it is convinced that "the enemy" is not capital, or the employing class, but prejudice, ignorance, distrust, lack of sympathy and comprehension.

Now what has social science to say to such unionism? Little that is not wholly favorable. Science, like plain hard sense, believes in the virtue of "reasoning together," of adjusting differences by conciliation and arbitration. It believes in union, organization, and system. The sort of science which, some fifty years ago, condemned trade union in principle, and saw neither necessity nor advantage in collective bargaining, was not scientific. A certain school of economics dogmatized arrogantly and mistook assumptions for facts. It talked of wage funds that could not be increased by unionism; it talked of fundamental harmonies; it talked of free markets and absolute mobility of labor and capital. It was severely logical and beautifully simple. The only trouble is that the facts did not warrant its theories. There is no wage fund; there are no absolutely free markets; there is no equality of opportunity; there is no absolute mobility of labor. Today political economy is more modest and recognizes its limitations and its dependence on social science. And social science, again like hard sense, finds that moderate and reasonable trade unionism, while sound as far as it goes, does not go far enough, does not face ultimate problems, does not take sufficient account of inevitable tendencies. Science must go deeper and farther, since more and more workmen go deeper and farther. After all, whatever the moderate union leaders may say, strikes and lockouts are not always peaceful, and

even when peaceful their cost represents so much waste. Industrial warfare and the fear of such warfare are bad for labor as well as for capital. Arbitration is better than tests of endurance, but arbitration does not remove friction. It settles nothing permanently, while society realizes more and more the need of security and stability. So does capital, and so does the philosophical trade unionist when he thinks of the future.

The attempt to dip into the future leads more and more workmen to embrace socialism. This is why the policy of modern socialism with reference to union labor is one of "pacific penetration," of aid and sympathy plus active propaganda. What the socialistic workman wants, we know. He is for government ownership and operation of industry. He is opposed to the wage system, to private control of the means of production. He sees no peace, no economy, no efficiency, no advance, except in a solution based on the establishment of industrial democracy. He is for independent political action of labor on a socialistic or semi-socialistic platform. We find larger and larger doses of socialism in trade-union programs.

This is natural enough, but only the rash and enthusiastic socialist will predict the conversion of a majority of working-men and working-women to his creed. The candid and level-headed socialist recognizes, first, that socialism has been evolving, undergoing a serious transformation, making concessions to the spirit of individualism, on the one hand, and to the spirit of realism, on the other; and he recognizes, secondly, that, in spite of these concessions and revisions, a revolt against socialism, as well as against the method of political action, or parliamentary reform, is spreading among the very elements that were once counted on to carry socialism to victory. A study of so symptomatic a book as *The Great State* by H. G. Wells and others will convince any intelligent reader that socialism is gradually surrendering much of what was regarded as vital by the writers and leaders of the period of Marx, Engels, and Hyndman. Certainly social science has not been induced to put its seal on socialism. The objections to socialism—economic, social, psychological, moral—have not been met, and there is nothing in the trend of current discussion to indicate that

they ever will be, or can be, met. It hardly needs saying that the adoption by states and nations of measures that have been *called* socialistic by friends or opponents signifies nothing in this connection. It is puerile to say that, because we have established postal savings banks and a parcel post, because we have municipal trading up to a certain point, or are contemplating without alarm government ownership and operation of railroads and telegraphs, society is bound to go all the way to complete socialism. If history teaches anything, it teaches that programs are never carried out in life as they are worked out on paper.

Nor is it merely a matter of inference and prediction. Already we observe an anti-socialist movement where it was least expected. The reference is to so-called syndicalism in the world of the proletariat. Syndicalism is as much a revolt against socialism as it is a repudiation of conservative trade unionism. What the syndicalist wants is decidedly not what the socialist wants. The syndicalist ideal is not state ownership and control of industry, but ownership and control by the workers themselves. The syndicalist is opposed to government by majorities of which middle-class voters, intellectuals, and professional men constitute a part. He has no room for "outsiders." The workers in any industry are to take over the industry and run it for their own benefit. And they are to do this without elections, ballots, or political action. The syndicalists are for what they call "*direct action*." By direct action they mean strikes, constant warfare, agitation, and organization against capitalists and employers as a class. Some of them look forward to a great general strike, to total paralysis of capitalistic industry, and to a sort of catastrophic expropriation of the masters. Others admit that the general strike is a myth, their idea being that effective organization of labor, especially of unskilled labor, will render the great strike unnecessary. Much in syndicalism is crude, foolish, and even suicidal. The advocacy of *sabotage* (destruction of machinery, crippling of distribution and exchange, harrying of employers, etc.) will not long remain a feature of its programs. Opposition to conciliation, arbitration, the making and keeping of contracts with employers, is also bound to yield to the teaching of experience, pleasant or unpleasant. There is, fundamentally, no

necessary connection between the principles and ideals of syndicalism and such accidental, temporary excrescences as *sabotage* or the propaganda of hatred and chronic warfare. The quintessence of syndicalism, in short, need not be a criminal or pathological phenomenon. It is, in reality, reducible to three things—the substitution of industrial unionism for trade unionism; the avoidance of political action; and the repudiation of state socialism. We can easily imagine the intelligent syndicalist saying to a moderate trade unionist: "I have far more in common with you than with the socialist. You do not depend on the ballot; you do not seek to form a political labor party. But your form of organization is ineffective; you cannot even strike successfully; and you live from hand to mouth."

Now it is merely stating a fact to say that syndicalism is no more entitled to claim scientific approval than state socialism is. The aggressive tone and confident pretensions of the syndicalist philosophers, who speak in the name of science, history, and metaphysics, no more impose on the sober-minded student than did the equally arrogant claims of the socialists of the last half of the nineteenth century.

But social science has something to say in the premises. It finds a soul of good in things confused, erroneous, evil. It notes what the trade unionist wants, what the socialist wants, what the syndicalist wants—or what these think they want—and finds that the differences between them can be reconciled. Nay, it notes tendencies and beliefs among employers, as well as tentative conclusions among disinterested observers, that point to the same reconciliation, the same adumbration of a synthesis and a solution.

Let me state the indicated solution at once, and then offer significant proof, drawn from various quarters, of its soundness.

As all roads once led to Rome, so today, in social and economic thinking, all arguments lead to one conclusion, namely—that *society is moving toward co-operative industry and gradually displacing the capitalistic or wage system with its inevitable division of employers and employed into hostile camps*. For evidence we may first turn to the symposium on "What Labor Wants" mentioned at the beginning of this paper. That symposium is, indeed, a document of rare value.

The contributions thereto number exactly forty-eight, and of these the leading ones—the best informed, the most judicious and practical—declare for co-operation or profit-sharing, in one form or another, as the only possible solution of the labor problem.

Let me quote a few opinions.

A. H. Gilkies, Headmaster of Dulwich College: "If the directors of labor cannot themselves see the way to deal with those whom they employ so as to avoid successful strikes, then proper arbiters should be created whose verdict should be final. I fancy that, to be fair, they would have to move in the direction of assignment to workers of some share in the profits of every business concern."

The Rev. Lord William Gascoyne-Cecil: "Nothing allays the bitterness of the poor so much as the knowledge that rich people really care for their welfare; and any mechanism which can procure the meeting of rich and poor nearly always produces very good results. . . . I think five things will remove the bitterness: rising wages, contact between classes, co-partnership, truthful politicians, and a reasonable poor law."

Lord Hugh Cecil, M.P. (son of the late Marquis of Salisbury): "Almost everyone agrees that a partnership would be desirable. The doubt is whether its general adoption is possible. . . . It is very earnestly to be hoped that employees will endeavor to try the experiment wherever they think they can. By judiciously tried experiments we should learn very much and from the knowledge so acquired we might see our way to a more widespread extension of the remedy. And we must in frankness recognize that the existing system of self-interested competition is not one which can be absolutely justified. . . . Copartnership is not only an economic improvement, it is a moral advance. It is one step toward introducing a larger element of mutual trust and regard into the business of gaining wealth."

Philip Snowden, M.P.: "Until land and industrial capital are socially owned and industry is democratically controlled, there will be labor unrest."

The Duchess of Hamilton: "Had every workman a personal interest in the success of the whole business for which he is working, as in the old guild organization, the question of work being done would not arise."

Theodore Cook Taylor, M.P., woolen manufacturer and founder of a scheme of profit-sharing: "Some knowledge and twenty years' practical experience convince me that, of all expedients being discussed, none has so few drawbacks and so many advantages as a system of profit-sharing and labor co-partnership. . . . Why should morals and economics be placed in antithesis? The robbery of one class by another is always bad economics. The moralizing of industry tends not to general poverty, but to general wealth."

Seeborn Rowntree, employer and authority on social questions: "The capitalist should entirely shake off the idea that wage-earners are inferior beings, and should learn to regard them as valued and necessary partners in wealth production, partners with whose accredited representatives they may honorably discuss the propositions in which the wealth jointly produced should be divided."

Earl Grey, former governor-general of Canada: "If you wish to maintain the old friendly relations between employer and employed, you should establish your business on lines which will automatically create a feeling of loyalty on the part of all concerned to the industry with which they are connected. How is that to be done? By copartnership. Ideal copartnership is a system under which worker and consumer share with capitalists in the profits of industry."

Dr. Arthur Shadwell: "Copartnership is the most rational of all the proposals, the most in harmony with reality, and the least disturbing. It has more often failed than succeeded in practice, as yet, but when it succeeds, its success is thorough. It certainly has a future, and it might be encouraged by loans to workmen; but it is not applicable to everything. A constructive and successful syndicalism would be a form of copartnership."

These quotations constitute a striking array of testimony. The idea of co-operation and profit-sharing is clearly in the air. Men in all classes and conditions are turning to it as affording a practical as well as scientific solution of the bitter and burning problem. I may mention the late Goldwin Smith, Dr. Eliot, President-Emeritus of Harvard, and Dr. Albion W. Small, the editor of this *Journal*, as influential champions of co-operation, profit-sharing, and industrial democracy. It may be added that the socialist contributors to the

symposium, whom I have not quoted, may properly be called as witnesses for the same side. They may not agree that copartnership is the final solution, but they would certainly accept it as a stride toward their goal. Mr. H. G. Wells, for example, while advocating a great national plan of some sort, which, we may infer, would embody a considerable part of the socialistic program, admits that, for the present, a cure would be found in commercial partnership between employer and employed. The socialist who should obstinately refuse to encourage co-operation and systematic profit-sharing would write himself down a fanatic and bigot. The experience and thought of the last two decades have thoroughly discredited the "all or nothing" school or the school that believes that "the worse things are, the better for the proletariat." At a recent congress of German Social Democrats resolutions were passed favoring co-operation and urging support and recognition of it. A generation ago this would have been deemed treason and detestable heresy.

If we have the right to count socialists as conscious or unconscious champions of co-operation and profit-sharing, it follows that the syndicalists may likewise be summoned to serve the same conservative-progressive cause. As Dr. Shadwell recognizes, with other unprejudiced thinkers, "A constructive and successful syndicalism would be a form of copartnership." And is it not, after all, the central idea of industrial democracy without bureaucracy or outside interference that attracts the intelligent syndicalist? Is it not certain that time must convince him that neither class warfare, nor violent expropriation of present owners, nor a great strike, nor opposition to political action in every form can be regarded as a vital part of his ultimate creed? Would he reject the aid of the state, or of the bourgeois and intellectual elements, toward realizing his ideal if he were satisfied of the sincerity of the proffer? Would he insist on catastrophic transformation at any cost, even if evolutionary transition were demonstrated to be more natural and more favorable to labor itself? Such questions answer themselves.

It is interesting to note that the conclusion indicated above is also the conclusion of Professor and Abbé Dimnet, of the College Stanislas, of Paris, in a singularly impartial article on "Syndicalism

and Its Philosophy" which appeared in the *Atlantic* for January. M. Dimnet is a good Catholic, and to him idealism is life and thinking means Catholicism, but while emphasizing the need of idealism he admits that in co-operative industry and commerce are to be found "the most effective means of social and material improvement." He says: "Nothing can break the impulse which the syndicalist movement has now taken, and nobody with a sense of fairness can be sorry for it. There will be more and more syndicates and it is inevitable that their development should in time largely modify the economic and—to a certain extent—the present political conditions."

The modification of the economic (and of necessity also the political) conditions will not, one need hardly say, be the work of syndicalism alone. Trade unionism, socialism, individualistic opposition to state or bureaucratic despotism will severally contribute to the same general result. The forces will act and react on one another, as well as on the existing highly unstable order of things. We are justified, it would seem, in thinking that all the streams of tendency converge toward a co-operative system.

Reference has been made to the vain effort of socialism and syndicalism to usurp the authority of social and moral science. Have scientific economics and scientific sociology been taken unawares by the recent "discovery" of co-operation as a remedy for industrial unrest? By no means. Fifty years ago John Stuart Mill, a broad-minded and far-sighted economist, attributed strikes and agitation to "the inequalities of the industrial world due to the subjection of labor to monopoly and the enormous share which the possessors of the instruments of production are able to take from the produce." Mill was a fervent advocate of co-operation; he was even accused of leaning unduly toward a moderate form of socialism. What attracted him, the champion of liberty, in socialistic schemes was the element of democracy and equity embodied in co-operative industry.

Nay, we have a better authority than the semi-individualistic Mill. Herbert Spencer, the militant individualist, the bitter foe of the socialistic or half-socialistic state, advocated and foresaw the spread of industrial and commercial co-operation. His chapter on

"Co-operation" in his *Principles of Sociology* is one of the most progressive ever penned by him. In co-operation, he writes, "the transition from the compulsory co-operations of militancy to the voluntary co-operation of industrialism is completed." A wage-worker is not entirely free; he is cowed by fear of discharge, by the superintendent or foreman; he feels that he is under someone and working for another's benefit. Under co-operation the workman's activities are as voluntary as they can be, given man's physical needs and subordination to nature. Under co-operation the workman is his own employer, and no doubtful profit is taken out of his earnings. Spencer, after quoting reports of various co-operative enterprises, closes his chapter as follows: "Such few co-operative bodies . . . might be the germs of a spreading organization. Admission into them would be the goal of working-class ambition. They would tend continually to absorb the superior, leaving outside the inferior to work as wage-earners; and the first would slowly grow at the expense of the last. Obviously, too, the growth would become increasingly rapid since the master-and-workman type of industrial organization could not withstand competition with this co-operative type so much more productive and costing so much less in superintendence."

Other sociologists and economists might be quoted to show that scientific thinkers years ago anticipated the growth of the co-operative idea. The "few" survivals of the time when Spencer wrote have in truth had many imitators. Wisdom in some cases, necessity in others; the initiative of capital here, of labor there, to say nothing of the eloquent example of distributive co-operation in England—all such influences have aided in the steady advance of co-operative production or profit-sharing. Failures are still not uncommon; workmen and even labor leaders are still suspicious of most forms of profit-sharing, and especially of the most natural and modern form of it—investment of labor's savings in the stocks and bonds of the corporations which employ it. Too many workmen still think of their freedom, dignity, and manhood in terms of strikes, boycotts, and anti-injunction acts. When a large employer or corporation suggests a scheme of profit-sharing, a scheme of stock-purchase by the employees on easy terms, some of the men scent

danger and say or think that the whole purpose of the scheme is to weaken unionism, to discourage strikes, to divide labor. It is not probable that one employer in twenty proposes profit-sharing from motives of pure altruism; but to the thoughtful observer and student of history this is neither strange nor discreditable. Enlightened self-interest will do admirably in many spheres, provided the enlightenment is as pronounced as the self-interest.

The truth is, the problem of labor unrest, of strikes that are almost "revolutionary" in their effects, that paralyze industry, commerce, or transportation, is more vividly presented *as* a problem to employers than it is, as yet, to employees. The latter are still struggling to defend their "rights;" any suggestion of compulsory or semi-compulsory arbitration angers and alarms them. Not long have they enjoyed the freedom of organization and collective bargaining. Even today here and there a fossilized court renders a decision prohibiting a sympathetic strike or a union-shop contract. Labor is still militant, distrustful, aggressive. Employers and corporate chiefs, on the other hand, realizing more and more that legal restrictions are a broken reed to lean on, and that labor organizations must be reckoned with more and more, are earnestly turning their attention to preventives and remedies. This means that the classes or professions in closest contact with capitalists and employees are also prompted to inquire into the situation. For a time we may, therefore, expect more vigorous advocacy of co-operation from the classes named than from labor and its accredited spokesmen, and, for a time again, these proposals will continue to excite suspicion or adverse criticism. But in the end, interest, if not sweet reasonableness, must open labor's eyes to the intrinsic advantages of co-operation.

Moreover, the "third party," the great public, is beginning to take a hand in industrial controversies. For many years the interests of the public not only suffered total neglect from the direct parties, the employers and the unions, but were tacitly surrendered by the public itself. That is to say, the public scarcely even complained of the waste and the hardships to which strikes and lockouts subjected it. It supposed itself to be without power in the premises. It did not see what it could do, and it even assumed that to

do anything—beyond pleading for conciliation and arbitration—was to undermine the foundations of our modern civilization. Was not the right to strike, like the right to lock out workmen at will, a corollary from the general principles of free contract, free industry, and private property? Was not the sole duty of the public to stand aside and let capital and labor fight out their battles? This attitude is rapidly changing. The public is beginning to challenge the principles that underlie free strikes and free lockouts. It is beginning to raise its voice in favor of compulsory or semi-compulsory arbitration laws. It supports minimum-wage proposals, as was shown in England during the crisis caused by the general miners' strike. If, it reasons, industrial peace is better for all, why should not society impose peace? Why should it not veto strikes in the whole field of public utilities? Why, in granting franchises to railroads, telegraph and telephone companies, etc., should it not make arbitration of disputes over wages, hours, conditions of work, recognition of unions, a condition of the grant?

Yet it is doubtful whether in English-speaking countries mere compulsion in the form of arbitration laws and minimum-wage statutes will meet the requirements of the situation. The spokesmen of the public—economists, moralists, social workers, sociologists—will increasingly find that the line of least resistance is the line of profit-sharing and co-operation, of forms and methods of industrial organization that remove the necessity for warfare, for trials of endurance and strength. Organized labor will listen with more sympathy and open-mindedness to suggestions from neutral quarters than to suggestions possibly inspired by bias and class feeling.

Nor is this all. Another important, if indirect, factor remains to be mentioned. The gospel of what is popularly known as the peopleization of corporations is not consciously connected with the efforts to solve the labor problem. But it cannot be doubted that the moralization and socialization of corporations—the enforcement of publicity as to corporate finance, the prevention of stock inflation and dishonest manifestation of corporate securities, the suppression of injurious trusts—will, among other large effects, destroy the gravest obstacle to profit-sharing and copartnership. Not long ago

an individualistic economist and a friendly critic of trade-union policies, in arguing against strikes on the score of their futility and cost to labor, asked what the situation would be today if, for the last two or three decades, the powerful unions, instead of accumulating vast funds for offense and defense, instead of financing stubborn contests, had systematically invested the funds in the securities of the great industrial corporations. The ideal of the more intelligent syndicalists, he pointed out, would be much nearer realization than it is. Labor would by this time have acquired ownership and control of a good many industries, would have secured representation on many corporate directorships, and would have extensively democratized industry. It is plain, however, that even if the purpose and plan in question had been conceived by the unions, the mysteries of corporate finance, the public agitation against corporate abuses, the inadequacy or positive viciousness of the laws governing corporate organizations, the helplessness of minority stockholders—all these things would have deterred the unions from investing their funds in corporate securities. The peopleizing of corporations and the protection of investments by eliminating needless risk would enable labor leaders and individual workmen to entertain with growing favor the idea of copartnership by means of stock-ownership. The corporations that really wish to live in peace and security, to cultivate relations of amity with labor, would find fewer difficulties to overcome, and their good faith in offering stock to employees would be far less open to challenge and misrepresentation.

This is not the place, however, to consider why particular forms of profit-sharing have not prospered or succeeded in gaining the favor of intelligent workmen. Nor is it the place to study the various possible or prevalent forms of profit-sharing. There are official and private reports on the subject which show what to avoid in profit-sharing schemes and how to insure a reasonable degree of material and moral success. It may be noted in passing that, according to the latest report issued by the British Board of Trade, profit-sharing has received something of a stimulus in the last few years. Of the 133 firms that share profits after one fashion or another, 46 are less than four years old and 6 were started in 1912.

It also appears from this document that, while many profit-sharing schemes have had to be abandoned in Great Britain, "the experience of the firms which have tried profit-sharing" for a reasonable time "is that it produces excellent results in developing a higher degree of efficiency and brings about more harmonious relations between employer and employed." If excellent results can be produced in spite of deep skepticism and distrust on the part of the majority of workmen, and in spite of a hostile tone in the average labor organ, what may we not expect from profit-sharing and co-operation when heartily supported by strong unions and advocated with conscious reference to an economic and social ideal?

In the long run, "what labor wants" is not essentially different from what labor *ought* to want, from what employers and society ought to want, in the light of industrial evolution and soberly drawn inferences from contemporary experience. The past was what it had to be, but the great industrial revolution brought evils as well as benefits in its train, and another industrial revolution is impending—nay, is taking place before our eyes. It is idle to ask of human intelligence and character more than they are capable of yielding; but there are such things as prevision, as scientific guidance, as the possibility of facilitating inevitable change. In investigating, in criticizing, in resisting dangerous tendencies, we should endeavor to separate the accidental and ephemeral from the vital and enduring. To see the industrial problem steadily and see it whole is to arrive at conclusions that are as scientific as they are optimistic.